

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

## THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ARCHAEOLOGISTS

The attendance at the second International Congress of Archaeologists held in Egypt in April of this year far exceeded that of the Congress at Athens four years ago, the enrolment reaching 860. French scholars were in the majority; Germans and Austrians together formed the next largest body. Russia, Greece, Italy, and other European countries were well represented. But the attendance from England and the United States was very small and only three papers in the English language were presented, two of these by residents of Egypt.

Preliminary sessions were held in Alexandria April 7 and 8. Here the papers were concerned with Alexandrian art. The formal opening of the Congress took place April 10 in the opera house of Cairo. M. Maspero, director of the Service des antiquités of Egypt, and chairman of the local committee, presided. The address of welcome was made by the khedive. This was followed by greetings to the congress conveyed by M. Cavvadias, of Athens, in behalf of the Permanent Committee of the International Archaeological Congress; Signor Breccia, director of the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria, representing the Italian government; Professor Crusius, of Munich, speaking for the Bavarian Academy; and M. Babelon, representing the French Institute. Finally Mr. Arthur H. Smith, of the British Museum, ably discharged the difficult task of speaking for the universities of the world!

The meetings for the presentation of papers were held on three successive mornings, April 12, 13, and 14, the Congress convening in six sections. These sections with their presidents were: I, Prehistoric Archaeology, M. Leite de Vasconcellos, P. Wolters; II, Classical Archaeology, P. Cavvadias, E. Reisch; III, Papyrology, L. Mitteis, M. Vitelli; IV, Religious Archaeology, Monseigneur Duchesne, A. H. Smith; V, Byzantine Archaeology, Theodore Ouspensky, G. Lambros; VI, Numismatics and Geography, E. Babelon, Prince Soutzo. Sections I, II, IV, and V met in the Savoy Hotel, where the business office of the Congress was situated, sections III and VI in another part of the city at the newly founded Egyptian University. As the sections met simultaneously it was impossible, even for the most strenuous, to hear many of the papers.

Meeting in this land, under the auspices of a committee composed of Egyptologists, the Congress naturally gave special attention to the relations of Greece and Rome with Egypt. The old question of the degree and kind of indebtedness to Egypt incurred by the Aegean peoples of

the Bronze age was renewed — with the usual result, the acknowledgment of stimulus and artistic motives derived by the north from Egypt and warm defense of the originality and superior artistic endowment of the Aegean peoples. Such papers were M. A. J. Reinach's Les rapports de la Crète et de l'Égypte à propos des sarcophages de Haghia Triada and Dr. G. Karo's Über mykenische und aegyptische Waffen. More that was new and definitely informing was contained in the papers discussing Egyptian objects and imitations of Egyptian objects found in distant countries, such as that by M. Pierre Paris entitled Antiquités fausses d'Égypte en Espagne and M. B. Touraïeff's paper, Sur les objets égyptiens et égyptoïdes trouvés dans la Russie méridionale. The commercial relations between Egypt and the Greek colonies of the Black Sea in the seventh and sixth centuries B. C. and again in the Hellenistic age were traced by Herr E. von Stern, of Odessa. Purely Egyptological was Professor Georg Steindorff's account of the funerary temple of Chephren, excavated this season by the Sieglin expedition; the ground-plan of this imposing pyramid temple is now clear in all its main features and it is established that, like the gateway of the same precinct (the so-called temple of the Sphinx), the temple was without relief decoration, depending on the beauty of the granite and alabaster surfaces for its effects. In the Byzantine section one of the most interesting addresses was that of the learned head of the Russian Archaeological Institute in Constantinople, Theodore Ouspensky, on the recently uncovered mosaics of the Church of St. Demetrius in Salonica. Mr. J. Quibell's account of the Monastery of St. Jeremias at Sakkara, which he is now excavating for the Service des antiquités, was of keen interest. The site is still marked on the maps, "Roman Village," but in two seasons' work the monastery church, the cells of the monks, the refectory, and the burial chapel have all been uncovered. The buildings are not earlier than 480, one of the known dates in the life of the founder, St. Jeremias, and there is evidence in graffiti that by the tenth century they had fallen into disuse. Especially noteworthy and varied in design are the numerous carved friezes and capitals found in the ruins of this monastery. Taken all in all, however, the communications of members of the congress were somewhat disappointing and there was a general feeling that the congress justified itself rather in the benefit of personal intercourse with colleagues from various lands and in the acquaintance gained with Egyptian monuments.

Monsieur Maspero and other Egyptologists were untiring in conducting small parties through the Egyptian Museum, elucidating its wonderful treasures. Max Herz-Bey and his associates of the Arabic Museum performed a similar service in the mosques of Cairo and in the Arabic Museum. Excursions were also organized under expert leadership to the Coptic churches of Cairo. The pyramids of Gizeh were seen under

unusually happy conditions in that a very large company of mounted police kept the annoying Arabs entirely in the background. On the afternoon of the 13th, the khedive received five hundred of the members of the congress at the Abdin Palace, democratically shaking hands with each of his guests. His Highness further entertained the congress the next day at tea at the Barrage, the journey thither being made in the khedive's private yachts. Warm appreciation is due the members of the local committee for the time and strength they have devoted to the congress; even now, when the sessions have closed, many of them are taking the wearisome journey to the south to guide members of the congress who, despite the lateness of the season and consequent heat, wish to have a glimpse of the monuments of Upper Egypt.

The closing general session was held April 15 in the Egyptian University. Rome was chosen as the next place of meeting. Regulations formulated by the Permanent Committee along lines suggested in 1905 were read, article by article, and adopted. One of the changes from the original plan of organization is the introduction of a special section, "Archaeology of Oriental Countries."

C. L. RANSOM

Cairo April 16, 1909

## THE SIMPLE PAST CONDITION WITH POTENTIAL INDICATIVE IN APODOSIS

This form of conditional sentence is recognized in various discussions of the Greek conditional sentences, for example, by implication in the Greek Moods and Tenses of Goodwin, § 403, and explicitly in the Kühner-Gerth Ausführliche Grammatik in a remark appended to the discussion of the unreal conditional sentence, Paragraph 574, Anmerk. 2. Goodwin and the others who discuss the matter give, so far as I have been able to observe, no example of this construction which does not imply a denial of the protasis. The only example given in Kühner-Gerth which apparently shows this combination "eines realen Indikativs im Vordersatze mit einem irrealen oder potentialen Indikativ im Nachsatze" is Dem. 19. 153 εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν, ὡς ἦσαν τότε, Φωκεῖς σῷ καὶ Πύλας εἶχον, ἐκεῖνος μὲν ὑμῖν οὐδὲν ἄν εἶχεν ἀνατείνασθαι φοβερόν, δι' ὁ τῶν δικαίων ἄν τι παρείδετε.

The Kühner-Gerth translation of  $\epsilon i \ \eta \sigma a \nu \ldots \kappa a \lambda \ \Pi i \lambda a s \ \epsilon i \chi o \nu$  is si  $erant \ldots habebant$ . This is seen to be manifestly wrong if the passage is examined in its context. The sentence means "if the Phocians were (now) or had remained unharmed as they then were, Philip would not have been able to intimidate you." It is an unreal condition, as the whole passage following in which Demosthenes discusses what might have been  $(\xi \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon)$  shows. Weil in his note on this passage translates: "si enim essent ut tum erant." Voemel also in his Latin translation